

**REMARKS**

The Title and Claims 1 and 7 have been amended and new claims 8 and 9 have been added.

Claims 1-9 are now pending and under consideration.

**I. OBJECTION OF THE TITLE:**

The Title has been amended to recite "DATA PROCESSING SYSTEM WITH MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS TO ALLOCATE A GROUP OF RESOURCES TO CLIENTS". Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is overcome.

**II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112:**

As previously mentioned above, claims 1 and 7 have been amended to overcome this rejection. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

In item 4 on page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claim 3 would be allowable if the claims were amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

**III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 6 AND 7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY GOLUB ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 5,794,035; HEREINAFTER "GOLUB"):**

The present invention as recited in claim 1, for example, relates to a data processing system which allocates necessary resources to requesting clients. The data processing system comprises grouping means for defining groups of resources, group management means for managing the groups and a detection means, responsive to a request from a client that demands a specific group of resources, for detecting whether the requested group includes a member resource that is currently used by any other client. The data processing system as recited in claim 1, for example, further discloses a determination means for determining, if said detection means has detected a member resource in use, whether the detected member resource is to be modified by any other client currently using the detected member resource. The data processing system further comprises a permission means for permitting the requesting client to make access to the requested group of resources when the detection means finds that none of the member resources of the requested group are being used by any other client, and when the determination means finds that neither any other client currently using the detected member resource nor the requesting client intends to modify the detected member resource in use.

Golub discloses a device driver and input/output hardware research manager (HRM)

which tracks the use of the input/output resources (see Abstract). The HRM can allocate the resources between device drivers and provide a standard implementation to be used by device drivers. Further, the HRM determines if another client is currently accessing certain resources and if not, the HRM directly grants the resources to the requesting client. However, if another client is accessing the resources, the HRM must inquire as to whether and when the other client can yield the resources. The result determines if the requesting client can access the Resources or if the requesting client must wait until the original client is willing to yield the Resources (see column 7, lines 35 to 42).

Therefore, Golub fails to teach or suggest a data processing system which allocates necessary resources to requesting clients comprising "determination means for determining, if said detection means has detected a member resource in use, whether the detected member resource is to be modified by the other client currently using the requested member; and permission means for permitting the requesting client to make access to the requested group of resources if said detection means finds that none of the member resources of the requested group are being used by any other client, and when said determination means finds that neither the other client nor the requesting client intends to modify the detected member resource in use," as recited in amended claim 1.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4 AND 5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER GOLUB:**

As mentioned above, Golub fails to teach or suggest all of the features as recited in claim 1 from which claims 4 and 5 depend. Therefore, claims 4 and 5 patentably distinguish over Golub at least due to their dependency upon claim1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**V. CONCLUSION:**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

August 24, 2004

By:

Deidre M. Davis

Deidre M. Davis

Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501